SPEECH OF MR. JOHN CHARLTON, M.P.

IN

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MARCH 28TH, 1893

RECIPROCITY NEGOTIATIONS

DOCUMENTS AND STATEMENTS

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT CONDUCT AND MOTIVES

NO REAL EFFORT MADE FOR RECIPROCITY

Explanation of Diverse Statements at Washington and Ottawa

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to make some remarks on this question. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his speech on the tariff, following mine of some days ago, made some personal allusions to myself and some charges with regard to my veracity in some statements which I had previously made in reference to the negotiations at Washington. In questioning my veracity, he referred to the fact in disparaging terms that I was a Presbyterian elder and a promoter of Sabbath legislation, and stated that under these professions I cloaked my attempt to deceive the people and to make false representations as to the motives and character of the operations of the Government. Now, I may say that I have the utmost contempt for thus dealing with the private character of a member of this House. I do not intend to retaliate on the hon. gentleman. If I were to do so, I dare say I might possibly find something in his record that would not be more creditable than being a Presbyterian elder; but it is not my intention to do so. I intend, however, to justify the position I took with regard to the course of the Government in their negotiations or their professed negotiations at Washington. The observations and charges made with regard to the course I took render it necessary for me to vindicate myself in this matter. Now, the hon. member has brought down a report in which he professed to give a history of the negotiations at Washington. In that report he simply reiterated and reaffirmed the statements he had previously made. I am unable to imagine what purpose was served by the bringing down of that professed report. The hon. member had repeatedly made the same statement, and it was somewhat significant—I think it was a little invidious—on the part of the hon. gentleman to bring that report down at a time when Secretary Blaine, one of the actors in that matter was dead, and when another of the actors, Secretary Foster, had ceased to be Secretary of State, and had not only ceased to be an official and to act in an official capacity at Washington, but had left the country as well, and was at that time in Europe. I do not understand why the document should have been brought down at that time. However, it was brought down. The date of that communication was 15th February, 1892, it was laid on the Table of the House the 7th March, 1893. Now, I repeat that it was simply a reiteration of the statement frequently made by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and it might almost seem that there would be grounds for laying the charge that the writing of this communication was an afterthought, and that it had actually been written after these statements had been frequently made and reiterated, and after these negotiations had been made. However, whatever may be the conclusion as to the good taste of the hon. gentleman in making this statement after Mr. Blaine was dead, and after Mr. Foster had ceased to be Secretary of State, the document is not conclusive evidence because it was not confirmed by the American participants in the negotiations. It was a statement made by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and that statement happens to be in direct conflict with the statements made by Secretary Blaine and Secretary Foster and President Harrison. After a careful examination of that document, I have arrived at a conclusion, which will perhaps exonerate members of this Government and members of the United States Government from any intention to make misrepresentation, and I think I will be able to show to the House that there was a possibility of a misunderstanding, and that

the Finance Minister had actually been labouring under a misapprehension in the statement he has made that the condition of the American Government was positively that there should be uniformity of tariff between the two countries. Mr. Blaine says, in his reports furnished to Congress :

> The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854, nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone, and that, in view of the great development in the industrial interests of the United States and of the changed condition of the commercial relations of the two countries, since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedule of articles for free or other exchange under any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

Now, the hon. gentleman will mark the language ; not that there should be unrestricted reciprocity, not that there should be absolute admission into the markets of Canada of all American manufactures ; but the condition laid down by Mr. Blaine was that the treaty should not be confined to reciprocity in natural products, but that there should be, in addition, a list of manufactured articles to be agreed upon between the commissioners of Canada and the authorities of the United States. The Canadian commissioners refused to recede, in the slightest degree, from the position they took. They came to Washington with the ultimatum : Give us reciprocity in natural products, or, if you will not, we will not talk the matter with you at all ; we will have our way, we will make no concessions, we will engage in no diplomatic discussion to see whether we cannot arrive at an agreement ; but we lay down our ultimatum, which is the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with modifications such as the hon. gentleman explained afterwards. And I will show what his explanations were. This was their ultimatum. Mr. Blaine's request that they should agree upon a list of manufactured articles—a list—not all manufactures—and that they should make propositions were not acceded to, and no attempt was made to see if there was any possibility of making a reciprocity treaty. There was room for diplomatic discussion ; there was room for an honest attempt, on the part of the Canadian commissioners, to see if they could possibly secure a treaty of commerce with the United States. It was not reasonable for those gentlemen to go to Washington and lay down an ultimatum which the Americans would have to accept. And it was not reasonable to lay down an ultimatum and refuse to discuss the question. Discussion was absolutely and peremptorily closed by our commissioners, and the negotiations broken by their own act. Had my hon. friend opposite any reason to suppose, when he went to Washington, that his proposition for a treaty of reciprocity, based on the treaty of 1854, would be accepted ? Had he any reason to suppose it was worth his while going there to make that proposition ? Of course not. The American Government, time and again, assured this country that no such treaty would be accepted. Only a few days before the dissolution of the House of Commons, Mr. Blaine had expressly stated that no such proposition would be entertained by the American Government. This was clearly stated in his celebrated letter of 30th January. The commissioners went to Washington. Well, they were aware that the proposition they intended to make was one which would be unacceptable and inevitably refused. It was a foregone conclusion that that would be the result, and they were simply trifling with the question and the people when they went to Washington for the purpose of making such a proposition. It is worth while inquiring, Mr. Speaker, whether it would not have been possible for the Canadian commissioners to have slightly varied their conditions, and whether they should not have receded from the position they took, that they must absolutely have reciprocity in natural products alone or else accept no treaty. Was it not possible for them to have accepted Mr. Blaine's proposition, and made proposals on the lines of his suggestion that there should be a list of manufactured goods agreed upon ? They might have done that without discriminating against England at all. Why, Sir, they could have agreed upon a list that would embrace coal oil, barb wire, agricultural implements, nails, spikes, cars locomotives, common cottons, twine, carriages, clocks, certain kinds of glassware, threshers, portable steam engines, sewing machines, type-writers, machinery, edge tools, picks, spades, leather, printing presses, musical instruments, white paper, wall paper furniture an a great variety of other manufactured goods, which we import almost exclusively from the United States. They could have arranged a wide list of manufactured articles, and given, if necessary, to the American people preferential treatment in our market in these articles, and, at the same time, have not been under the necessity of discriminating against England, except, perhaps, to a very slight degree. If these commissioners had been honest in their professed desire to obtain reciprocity, if they had deigned to accept Mr. Blaine's proposal to talk the matter over and make propositions, if they had been willing to make the attempt to agree upon a list of manufactured articles, limited in extent, a list such as they likely will adopt in part before twelve months from this date, without reciprocity in view at all, they could have, in all human probability, secured access to the American market for our natural products in return for a concession which would have admitted a certain list of American goods which we do not import to any great extent from England, and which, if we give preferential treatment in our market, would not

have effected England to any considerable degree. I repeat that they could have done this beyond all question, and the whole course of their operations at Washington demonstrated the truth of the assertion that they were not there to get a reciprocity treaty; that they were not honest in their professions in regard to it, because if they had been, beyond all human question they could have obtained a treaty which would have freed trade to some extent, and would to a very slight degree discriminate against England.

Now, Sir, I wish to point out, and to do it fully, my reasons for charging the Government with deception in this matter. The allegation was made in the first place by the Government that the United States had made overtures. That was the allegation upon which they went to the country. That allegation, I think I shall be able to show, was without foundation. In the next place they gave people to understand that there would be no trouble to get a treaty. That was the universal impression in the country, that was the language of the press upon the subject, that was the language of the platform upon the subject. They went to the country, I repeat, with an implied, if not a positive promise, that reciprocity with the United States would be the outcome of their negotiations, which negotiations, they claimed, had been instituted as the result of overtures made by that country. Their partisans were led to expect reciprocity; their partisans freely promised reciprocity, and that promise was founded upon statements and representations made by the Government. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to a despatch which appeared in the Toronto "Mail," in January, 1891, and which was answered by a despatch appearing in the "Empire" on the following day. On the 15th of January, 1891, the Toronto "Mail" had a despatch which read as follows:—

It is reported from Ottawa, on authority which leaves little reason to doubt that the rumour is true, that the Imperial Government is urging the Dominion Ministers to unite in a proposition to arrange all matters in dispute between Canada and the United States on the basis of a wide measure of commercial reciprocity.

To that despatch the "Empire" made the following answer:—

The "Empire" is authorized to give this statement an unqualified denial. Not only is it not true, but, on the contrary, it is learned from the very best sources that the Canadian Government has recently been approached by the United States Government with a view to the development of trade relations between the two countries and that our Government has requested the advice of Her Majesty's Government on the subject.

Following this and called forth by this and similar statements which appeared in the Canadian press we have a letter from Mr. Baker, member of the United States House of Representatives, making inquiry with regard to this matter of the Secretary of State for the United States (Mr. Blaine). Mr. Baker writes, under the date of 29th January, 1891:

WASHINGTON, D.C., 29th January, 1891.

Hon. JAMES G. BLAINE,
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR Mr. BLAINE,—It is reported in the newspapers of Canada and along the northern border of my state, where my constituents are deeply interested in the subject, that negotiations are going on between this country and Great Britain, with a view of partial reciprocity with Canada, including natural products only and not manufactures, and it is stated that Sir Chas. Tupper is on his way here as commissioner to negotiate for such modification to our tariff. I would be very glad if you would enable me to answer my constituents.

Very truly yours,
CHAS. S. BAKER.

To this inquiry Mr. Blaine replies on the same day:

WASHINGTON, D.C., 29th January, 1891.

MY DEAR Mr. BAKER,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no scheme for reciprorcity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Chas. Tupper's coming to Washington.

Very truly yours,
JAMES G. BLAINE.

Now, the members of the Canadian Ministry were in possession of this statement of Mr. Blaine before the House was dissolved on the 3rd of February. They had the fact before them that these assertions were made with regard to their ability to secure reciprocity, and I repeat that they were guilty of duplicity and made representations to the people which they knew could not be redeemed. But this evidence did not silence their reciprocity assertions. They still continued to assert that they were able to get reciprocity, that they were likely to get it, that they were about to get it. On the 3rd of February the House was dissolved and the announcement of dissolution was made in the following terms in the Government organ, the Toronto "Empire":—

The sixth Parliament of Canada is at an end. Acting on the advice of his responsible Ministers, His Excellency the Governor-General has been pleased to dissolve the House of Commons and issue his writs for a new Parliament.

Nominations take place on Thursday, 26th February, polling on Thursday, 5th March. The writs are to be dated 4th February and made returnable on 25th April.

In view of the foregoing important statement, the question will naturally be asked, what are the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time? It is understood that the Dominion Government have through Her Majesty's Government made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to an extension of our commerce with that country. These proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration, and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty, which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House.

It is understood that Canada will send a delegation to Washington after 4th March, the date on which the life of the present Congress expires, for the purpose of discussing informally the questions of the extension and development of trade between the United States and Canada, and the settlement of all questions of difference between the two countries. This delegation will visit the United States capital, it is said, as the result of a friendly suggestion from Washington.

This notice that appeared on the 3rd of February, I may say, appeared simultaneously in the Montreal "Gazette." On the 4th of February the "Empire" published an official statement of the Government's proposals, and why they were made :

In view of the importance of the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present moment, the "Empire" is privileged to publish a copy of the despatch from His Excellency the Governor-General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, showing the nature of the Government's proposals to the United States, and indicating the earnest desire of the Administration for the development of trade between the United States and Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would inquire, if this official statement was not inspired by the Government, how came this Government organ to have an official despatch which could only have been obtained through the connivance of the Government, by the consent of the Government and by the primary action of the Government ? When this question was under discussion a few days ago, the Minister of Justice said in explanation of this statement that the "Empire" had this despatch from the "Canada Gazette." The "Canada Gazette" contains no such despatch between the 13th December, the date of the despatch, and the 3rd of February, the date of the dissolution. The statement made by the Minister of Justice suggesting that the Toronto "Empire" took this despatch from the "Canada Gazette" was misleading, and must have been purposely misleading, because it does not appear there ; and I ask the Minister of Finance if he will bear out to-day the statement made by the Minister of Justice on that occasion, that this despatch of the 13th December, 1890, was taken by the Toronto "Empire" from the "Canada Gazette," and was obtained in the usual course of an examination of the Government publications, or whether it was furnished by the Government to that paper for the purpose of carrying forward a scheme of deception ? Here is the despatch as it appeared in the "Empire" of 4th February :

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 13th December, 1890.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to send to Your Lordship to-day a telegraphic message in cipher, of which the following is the substance.

With reference to my telegram of the 10th inst., this Government is desirous to propose a joint commission, such as that of 1871, with authority to deal without limitation and to prepare a treaty respecting the following subjects :—

1. Renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interests of Canada and the United States.

2. Reconsideration of the treaty of 1888, with repect to the Atlantic fisheries, with the aim of securing the free admission into the United States markets of Canadian fishery products, in return for facilities to be granted to United States fishermen to buy bait and supplies and to tranship cargoes in Canada, all such privileges to be mutual.

3. Protection of mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic Ocean and in inland waters ; also

4. Relaxation of sea-board coasting laws of the two countries.

5. Relaxation of the coasting laws of the two countries on the inland waters dividing Canada from the United States.

6. Mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

7. Arrangements for setting boundary between Canada and Alaska.

The treaty would, of course, be *ad referendum*.

The manner in which this proposal came to be made to the United States Government is briefly as follows :— Several weeks ago when negotiations were in progress between Newfoundland and the United States looking to a reciprocity treaty, the Canadian Government made representations that Canada should have the option of being included in any arrangements with that colony as to the fisheries or trade. This contention was based on solemn assurances given by the Newfoundland Government two or three years ago, and repeated on successive occasions, that if any special privileges were allowed to any country in regard to the purchase of supplies or bait in Newfoundland such privileges would also be granted to Canada. The Secretary of State for the United States when he learned of the position of affairs, insisted that the negotiations should be carried on separately. He intimated, however, that he would not be unwilling to enter into negotiations with Canada, but preferred that they should be private and unofficial. The Dominion Government thereupon asked the Imperial authorities to remind Mr. Blaine that Canada had always been ready for a fair reciprocal arrangement and had made repeated offers to that effect, which, however, had been ignored or refused by the United States. It was further represented that the Dominion Government was willing, now that overtures had been made to them, to again negotiate, and that they would prefer that these negotiations should be official and under a commission from the British Government.

Now, Sir, the elections were brought on, the Ministers took the field, and let us see what their utterances were upon some occasions with regard to this matter. My charge, you will bear in mind, is that the Government were all the time holding out inducements to the country that they could obtain reciprocity ; they were asserting to the country that the United States had made overtures, and the United States being anxious for a treaty, there would be no difficulty upon their part in obtaining one. On the 7th February a great mass meeting was held in Toronto. That meeting was addressed, among other speakers, by the Minister of Customs, Mr. Bowell, by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster, by the Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson ; and Sir John Thompson, in the course of that speech, made some reference to this matter which I beg to trouble the House with, as I deem it of importance in connection with this case. He said :

A little over three months ago it transpired that negotiations were being entertained by the United States for the making of a treaty of reciprocity with the colony of Newfoundland. These negotiations have not yet ripened into a treaty, but they were proceedings on lines which were not unlike, so far as they went, the lines which Canada would be willing to pursue in any trade negotiations with that country, and not, mind you, at the dictation of the British Government, as has been untruly asserted in the press opposed to us, but on our own line, on hearing that these negotiations were progressing, we insisted upon the British Government demanding at Washington that Canada should have the option, if she pleased, of having Canada included in any treaty which might be made with the colony of Newfoundland, but we indicated at the same time that the proposed treaty with regard to Newfoundland did not seem to be upon lines so extensive as would suit the wants and interests of Canada, and that it might be better to avail ourselves at the same time of entering upon separate negotiations on behalf of Canada. (Cheers.) Well, Sir, that intimation was promptly conveyed by Her Majesty's Government to Washington, and the answer made by Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of the United States on behalf of his Government, was an overture to reciprocity. Now, these gentlemen may assert in this country that it was all moonshine and humbug about Mr. Blaine's being willing to entertain our negotiations, but it will be proved to you when the time comes that, in response to that, Mr. Blaine, whatever his sentiments may be—and I am bound for the present to give him credit for candour—as the negotiations with Newfoundland would not suit the Dominion of Canada for a trade treaty between these two countries, he was willing to make a wide treaty for reciprocity and enter upon separate negotiations with her. (Hear, hear.) That statement being made, we are bound to avail ourselves of that to extend our trade. We have never declared our unwillingness to trade with them. On the contrary, we are seeking extensions of trade in every direction. The next request from Mr. Blaine was that preparatory to negotiations being entered upon, we would propound a basis upon which the convention should eventually proceed. We did so in a document which has been published in the press, offering to consider the renewal of a reciprocity treaty of 1854, with such modifications as the altered circumstances of the two countries might call for. We asked him to reconsider the abortive treaty of 1888, which settled the fishery dispute along with trade questions, and which expressed our willingness likewise to enter into trade negotiations which would settle the Behring Sea difficulties and all questions upon the Atlantic coast with regard to fisheries, and to continue the coasting and wrecking business as well between the countries. Now, Sir, a good deal has been said to the people of Canada about the insincerity of all this. It is stated that having made that proposition to Mr. Blaine without any prospect of its being accepted, without any prospect of its being eventually entertained, Sir John Macdonald has sprung the elections upon the people of Canada under the pretense that he is going to enter into these negotiations, while in reality the Cabinet at Washington will have none of it. Let me tell you, so far from that being true, we had the proposition that was submitted to Mr. Blaine; that the answer that Mr. Blaine made to us was that he was willing to enter upon a preliminary discussion to precede the more formal commission; he was willing to enter upon that discussion and to consider all points embraced in it, but would not be prepared to do so until after the 4th of March, when the term of the present Congress expires. In the meantime, Sir, what would our position have been if we had not appealed to the country, if we had not gone to the people of Canada? It would have been said that in the very last hour of the existence of our Parliament, we were endeavouring to make a treaty which would entirely change the business of the country, and when we went to Washington we would have been comparatively weak in the hands of the men with whom we were negotiating, because the men with whom we were negotiating would know, that instead of being there with the confidence of the country behind us, we had to ask the assent of a Parliament which had already spent its last session before the negotiations had practically commenced. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) We would have the Government entering upon the most important treaty negotiations without a Parliament behind us, and what we would propose is that, if you and the people of Canada accept the policy that we put before you now, we will go to Washington with the Parliament behind us, and we will be able to treat with Mr. Blaine with the assurance that the Premier of this country has the renewed confidence of Canada. (Loud applause.)

Now, Sir, what inference was to be drawn from that speech of Sir John Thompson with reference to the reciprocity question and negotiations at Washington? Did he not plainly state that overtures were had from Mr. Blaine? Did he not plainly state that in pursuance of those overtures the Government were proposing to send their commission to Washington? Did he not plainly state that the prospects for a reciprocity treaty were so good that it was advisable for the Government to dissolve Parliament, have a new election, and call a new House fresh from the people, so that this treaty that the Government hoped to negotiate with the authorities at Washington could be laid before representatives fresh from the people, and not before a moribund House? I assert that the course of the Government, that the language of the members of the Government, that the whole of the policy pursued by the Government in regard to this question was a policy designed and calculated to lead the people of Canada to believe that they were about to obtain reciprocity, and that the promises of the Liberal party with regard to this matter need not be entertained, for while the Liberals were telling the people that they would secure reciprocity sometime in the future, if they came into power, the Government had reciprocity in their hands, and in order to have a new Parliament ready to sanction the treaty they were about to make they were holding a general election. There can be no question about that. If the impression prevailed in the country, as it assuredly did, and if this impression was not well founded, if the Government were not actually on the line of obtaining reciprocity, as the people were told and as they allowed their press and orators to assure the people, then, were the Government not pursuing an invidious and improper course in laying the case before the people, as Sir John Thompson did at Toronto, in permitting their organs and orators to talk about obtaining reciprocity and declaring that the matter was safe in their hands, when all the time the Government, although they sent commissioners to Washington to submit proposals, knew their

proposals would be rejected and could not under any circumstances be accepted. They knew this from Mr. Blaine's letter of 30th January, in which he distinctly stated that propositions of that character could not for one moment be entertained by the United States Government. They knew from the whole history of the facts since 1866, when the reciprocity treaty in natural products was abrogated, that the declarations of the Americans on every occasion had been that no such treaty would be renewed, that the United States agents would never enter into negotiations for reciprocity confined to natural products, but would in any event insist on the admission into the markets of Canada of some products of their labour which they had to sell and could exchange with the people of Canada for the products of their labour here, namely, the natural products. I will be able to show that the Government in the pursuit of this plan which they adopted violated the confidence of the Washington Government, that they made known the fact and had it talked about that reciprocity negotiations were in progress, when it was distinctly understood, and an explicit pledge had been exacted by Mr. Blaine that all the proceedings should be considered private and secret, and that negotiations should not be known or alluded to until the preliminary negotiations or conferences or talks had taken place between the commissioners or agents from Canada with members of the Washington Administration, and it had been decided whether there was any possibility of effecting a treaty or whether it had been demonstrated that the negotiations would be fruitless. Did the Dominion Government observe that pledge? I have here a letter from Secretary Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote bearing on this matter. It will be found in the Sessional Papers of 1891, volume 24, No. 38, page 83. Mr. Blaine in that communication to Sir Julian Pauncefote, dated 1st April, says:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON,
April 1st, 1891.

MY DEAR SIR JULIAN,—I duly received the note which you did me the honour to address to me on the 20th of March. I regret that for many reasons I have been unable to make an earlier response.

For convenience sake I here quote the substantial part of your note.

The quotation appears here.

A copy of the basis of negotiation which you placed in my hands on the 22nd of December last is appended hereto.

You told me, if my memory is not in error, that you were instructed by Lord Salisbury to propose the topics to the United States for discussion, and, if possible, for agreement.

I answered that I felt sure that the President would be unwilling to appoint a commission to consider the propositions as they were stated, and, furthermore, that I should be unwilling to submit them to the President.

After some further conversation, in which you repeated that the propositions were merely the basis upon which a discussion might be instituted, I replied that in any event I had not a moment to give to the subject until after the adjournment of Congress in March, but that after that date I would be willing to respond to your request "to have a full but private conference with the British Minister and one or more agents from Canada, and go over every point of difference, and consider every subject upon which a mutual interest could be founded.

"If an agreement is reached, all well; if not, no official mention is to be made of the effort.

"Above all things, it is important to avoid public reference to the matter.

"This the President will insist upon."

While no notes were exchanged between us I carefully minuted my modification of the paper you left with me containing Lord Salisbury's proposition, and did so immediately after you left the department. You will observe the private character which I wished to impart to the conference is recognized by you a month later in your note of 27th January, when you called the correspondence "confidential."

In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us——

Not a proposition from Mr. Blaine, but Sir Julian Pauncefote had come to the State Department with the proposal, and the subject was then for the first time mentioned between them.

—and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

I detail these facts because I deem it important, since the matter has been for some weeks open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not "initiated" by me, but on the contrary that the private arrangement of which I spoke was but a modification of your proposal and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States.

With this explanation it only remains for me to say that gentlemen representing the Dominion of Canada and proposing to discuss the commercial relations of the two countries may be assured of a courteous and cordial reception in Washington by the Government of the United States.

There is the statement of Mr. Blaine, a most explicit statement, and a most damaging statement to the Canadian Government, if that statement is true. Is there any confirmation of that statement? Let us see if there is any mention made of the statement by any of the parties interested. Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Foster, Mr. Bowell and Sir John Thompson went to Washington, and this letter from the Secretary of State of the United States to Sir Julian Pauncefote was laid before Sir Charles Tupper. And what did Sir Charles say about it? In his communication to Sir John Macdonald, 21st April, 1891, Sessional Papers, 1891, volume 24, No. 38, page 67, he says:

I told Mr. Blaine in reference to these charges, that I wished at the outset to recognize the accuracy of the statements contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote

fote, which I had sent in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding the reciprocity arrangements between the two countries.

That is what Sir Charles Tupper told the Hon. Mr. Blaine: That he wished to recognize and acknowledge the accuracy of this statement made in Mr. Blaine's letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote. That was simply an acknowledgment on the part of Sir Charles Tupper, that he and that Sir John Macdonald and that every party interested in that negotiation on behalf of Canada, had been guilty of duplicity, had been guilty of a breach of confidence in placing these facts before the people of Canada, contrary to their expressed pledges, and contrary to the arrangements made with Secretary Blaine; and in addition to that, they had made false representations, because they had stated that the negotiations were initiated by the Washington authorities, when the express declaration of Mr. Blaine, which was sanctioned and confirmed by Sir Charles Tupper, was: That these negotiations had been initiated by Sir Julian Pauncefote, and that for the first time they had been referred to, when he called upon Mr. Blaine in reference to the matter.

Now, let us see, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any other evidence upon this point. I have here a Minute of Council, passed on 18th December, 1890, which will be found in Sessional Papers for 1891, vol. 24, No. 38, page 13:

REPORT of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, on the 18th December, 1890.

The Committee of the Privy Council having learned that the Honourable the Secretary of State for the United States, had expressed to Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, his readiness to negotiate for a reciprocity treaty on a wide basis, and particularly for the protection of the mackerel fisheries, and for the fisheries on inland waters, and had subsequently stated to Her Majesty's Minister his great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty, they desire to take the opportunity afforded by these intimations from Mr. Blaine of suggesting the expediency of taking early steps to adjust the various matters that have arisen and now exist affecting the relations of Canada with the United States, or rather the relations between the Government of the United States and that of the United Kingdom on questions affecting Canada.

The most obvious means of carrying this object into effect, would be the appointment of a Joint Commission as in 1871.

The Committee of Council desire to suggest that such commission should be authorized to deal with all such questions without limitation as to range of discussion, and to prepare a treaty or convention as to such of those matters as they may come to an agreement upon.

The principal subjects for discussion would appear to be:—

1. The renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, subject to such modifications as the altered circumstances of both countries require, and to such extensions as the commission may deem to be in the interest of the United States and Canada.

2. The reconsideration of the treaty of 1888 respecting the Atlantic fisheries, with the view of effecting the free admission of Canadian fishery products into the markets of the United States in exchange for facilities for United States fishermen to purchase bait and supplies, and tranship cargoes in Canada. All such privileges to be mutual.

3. The protection of the mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic Ocean and on the inland waters.

4. The relaxation of the coasting laws of both countries on the sea-board.

5. The relaxation of the coasting laws of both countries on inland waters between the United States and Canada.

6. The mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

7. Arrangements for the delimitation of boundary between Alaska and Canada.

Such treaty to be, of course, *ad referendum*.

The Committee respectfully submit this minute for His Excellency's sanction.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk, Privy Council.

To the Honourable
The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir, here is a formal Minute, which repeats the assertion which Mr. Blaine denies, namely, that the Washington authorities had stated to Her Majesty's Minister their great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty with Canada, while the truth was, that Sir Julian Pauncefote, under the direction of his Government, prompted by representations from Ottawa, had himself gone to the Hon. J. G. Blaine and had initiated the proceedings, by proposing to open negotiations for reciprocity, and Mr. Blaine had told him then and there that it was useless to submit a proposal for a reciprocity treaty on the basis of the treaty of 1854, that, in fact, he would not submit such a proposal to the President at all, but that a private conference could be held to see if some common basis for agreement as to their views might be arrived at; and that statement made by Mr. Blaine, which is directly contrary to the affirmation of this Minute in Council and to the statement made by the Ministers upon the hustings, was afterwards confirmed by Sir Charles Tupper at Washington. When the letter of Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote was brought to his notice, he acknowledged that the statements of Mr. Blaine were true, and that he had been guilty of a breach of confidence and that Sir John Macdonald, as well, had been guilty of making statements which were not warranted by the facts. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of statements made by the Minister of Finance. On the 11th December, 1892, the Minister of Finance granted to a newspaper (the "Empire") reporter an interview with reference to the Message of the President of the United States, and in that interview the Minister of Finance made this statement:

I need not say that it causes surprise and regret—surprise at the nature of some of the statements made, and regret at the unfriendly tone adopted towards Canada. The statement that Canada was only prepared to offer to the United States the admission of natural products is not full enough to convey an accurate idea of what took place. The Canadian representatives asked those of the United States if they

were prepared to consider an arrangement on the basis of free admission of the natural products of both countries, as in the treaty of 1854, with such enlargements and modifications as the changed conditions of the two countries made necessary. The reply was a negative. With a view, then to clear the ground for arrangement wider than that, if such could be done, Mr. Blaine was asked as to certain conditions of a possibly wider arrangement, among others, whether the United States would insist upon a uniform tariff and would demand preferential treatment in our markets as against British and foreign goods. The answer was that a uniform tariff would be necessary and that, too, on the line of the present United States tariff, and that the United States could admit of no arrangements which did not give United States goods favoured treatment as against foreign goods, especially those of Great Britain, who was their chief competitor. To these propositions the Canadian representatives declined to agree. The conference then broke off so far as regarded the consideration of the commercial question. What the conference plainly developed was that the Canadian Government considered the practical surrender of its fiscal powers and absolute discrimination against Great Britain, with all that this involved, as too high a price to pay for any advantage which might accrue from a possible treaty.

Here is a distinct assertion made by the Minister of Finance, that the United States authorities required as a preliminary, as a condition to a reciprocity treaty, a uniform tariff, and that, too, on the lines of the present United States tariff. That was the assertion made by the Minister of Finance in this interview on 11th December. Now, this interview was brought to the attention of Secretary of State Foster at Washington on the following day, and he reviews all the points taken up in the interview. I shall only refer to those matters relating to reciprocity. In his review with reference to the reciprocity negotiations, Secretary Foster of Washington says :

During the reciprocity conference of last winter, Mr. Blaine did not insist that in a reciprocity arrangement a uniform tariff would be necessary for both Canada and the United States, nor much less, that it should be on the lines of the present United States tariff. He did ask that the schedule should not be confined to natural products, but should include an agreed list [not an unlimited list, but an agreed list] of manufactured goods, and that the reciprocity should be confined to Canada and the United States; and because of these two conditions the negotiations were fruitless.

Now, here is a direct issue between the Minister and the Secretary. If Secretary Foster of the United States is right, Minister Foster of Canada is wrong ; if Minister Foster of Canada is right, Secretary Foster of the United States is wrong ; one or the other is mistaken. There may be an intentional misrepresentation ; there may be merely a misunderstanding. I think I will be able to show that the probability is that there is merely a misunderstanding. The difference is an unfortunate one. It is greatly to be regretted that some record of the proceedings of that conference, attested by both parties, was not published. Then there could have been no question of fact or veracity, and no doubt as to the truthfulness of the record. There is one thing, perhaps, that might militate against Secretary Foster of the United States, in the estimation of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Secretary Foster is a Presbyterian elder, and I believe the Minister of Finance is not, and has a great dislike to them. This fact may, in the estimation of the Minister of Finance, make Secretary Foster an untrustworthy witness. Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to make an extract from the correspondence published and laid on the Table of this House on the 7th day of March —the official statement of the Canadian Government relating to the negotiations which took place at Washington with reference to reciprocity ; and I think I will be able to establish that the difference in regard to a uniform tariff on the lines of the United States tariff arose very naturally, and was probably simply a misunderstanding, and nothing more. This report says :

Mr. Foster went on to say that a third question arose at this point which was in its way not less important than the two already discussed ; namely, granted that discrimination in favour of United States' manufactures in the Canadian market was necessary, how should the standard of discrimination be fixed, and what should be its degree? Would the Canadian tariff have to be raised to an equality with that of the United States tariff upon these articles, or would the present Canadian tariff be accepted as sufficient, or would Canada be at liberty to fix the rate as and when she pleased, provided that the principle of discrimination were always maintained? He took the items of woollens and wool, and illustrated the above point by a comparison of tariffs on these in the two countries.

Mr. Blaine said that this was a vital point ; that under the existing tariffs on wools and woollens in the two countries, a reciprocity such as he (Mr. Foster) contemplated would result in manifest disadvantage to the United States, whose policy was one of large protection on wools as well as woollens. Unless such points were guarded there would be no security on the one hand from smuggling along a border line of over 3,000 miles in length, or on the other of maintaining the present policy of the United States. This could, in his opinion only be done by making the tariff uniform for both countries, and equalizing the Canadian with that of the United States.

Now, the mistake which the Minister of Finance has fallen into in connection with this matter is probably this : Mr. Blaine asserted that it would be necessary, with reference to wool and woollens, to make the tariff of the two countries uniform, and Mr. Foster accepted that assertion as applying to the entire tariff system of both countries. Now, why should Mr. Blaine raise this point as to the necessity of having a uniform tariff on wool and woollens ? It is very manifest. The United States has a duty on wool of 10 cents a pound, while Canada admits wool free. If the woollen manufacturers of these two countries under a reciprocity treaty were to pass interchangeably free of duty, it is evident that the Canadian manufacturer would have a vast advantage. He would be placing in the market of the United States goods made from free wool, while the Ameri-

can manufacturer would be obliged to compete with him in the markets of the two countries with goods made from wool charged with a duty of 10 cents a pound; and Mr. Blaine simply pointed out to Mr. Foster that it was necessary, in regard to wool and woollens, to have a uniform tariff. Either the United States should place wool on the free list or Canada should place wool on the dutiable list at the same rate as the United States. The necessity of this was obvious. You could not have reciprocity in wool and woollens unless both nations stood on the same footing with regard to the cost of their raw material. The same rule would be necessary with reference to the excise laws of the two countries. If whiskey, beer and tobacco were interchanged free of duty between the two countries, there must be the same excise laws in both; otherwise the two nations would not be on the same footing. This would be necessary in regard to any manufactured article made from imported raw material. If that raw material were admitted into one country free and taxed in the other, the two nations would not be on the same footing; and this is what Mr. Blaine unquestionably meant when he talked about a uniform tariff. If the hon. gentleman is willing to accept this explanation, it will settle the difficulty, and reconcile the difference between the two parties. He will simply have to say that he was under a misapprehension as to the scope of Mr. Blaine's reference to a uniform tariff, which was restricted instead of being unlimited, as he had supposed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a communication placed by Mr. Blaine in the hands of the President with regard to these reciprocity negotiations. I have read that portion of the statement of the Canadian commissioners which bears on this case. I will now read Mr. Blaine's statement, but before doing so, I wish to speculate a little as to the possibility of our Finance Minister making a mistake. Of course if he is in any sense or to any degree infallible, we will have to accept his word without question, but I may, perhaps, refer to one or two circumstances for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was ever known to make really glaring mistakes, and a mistake in his own department on a matter concerning which he ought to be thoroughly informed. I was looking over the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Petrolea on the 7th September last, where, speaking of our public debt, the hon. gentleman used the following language:—

The Opposition claimed that the Government of Canada was rolling up a debt. He would deal with that point. In 1889 the debt of the country was $237,000,000, in 1890 it was $237,000,000, in 1891 it was $237,000,000, and in 1892 it was $236,000,000. How was that for heaping up the debt? For four years the debt of the Dominion was not increased one dollar.

Now, that was the assertion of the Finance Minister, made on the 7th September. What does the blue-book show? According to the report of his own department, the net public debt on the 30th June, 1892, amounted to $241,131,000, and the monthly return made the 31st August, just seven days before he made the statement, showed that the public debt of Canada amounted on that day to $241,035,000; yet the hon. gentleman stated at Petrolea that the returns of the 30th June and the 31st August from his own department, with which he ought to have been familiar, showed a net debt of only $236,000,000. He made a misstatement of about $5,000,000. That, I think, settles the question of the hon. gentleman's infallibility. And I am afraid, after this evidence of financial weakness on his part, there may be something in the charge that he was equally subject to diplomatic weakness in the statement he made concerning the diplomatic conferences at Washington.

I propose to call attention to Mr. Blaine's official statement, contained in Executive document No. 14 of the 52nd Congress, 1st Session, made to the United States Senate. This communication was transmitted in a message from President Harrison, and President Harrison, in referring to the matter, says as follows:—

The result of the conference as to the practicability of arranging a reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada, is clearly stated in the letter of Mr. Blaine, and was anticipated, I think, by him and by every other thoughtful American who had considered the subject. A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products would have been such only in form. The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government. A treaty that should be reciprocal in fact, and of mutual advantage, must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles, and have secured to the United States a free or favoured introduction of these articles into Canada as against the world; but it was not believed that the Canadian Ministry was ready to propose or assent to such an arrangement. The conclusion of the Canadian commissioners is stated in the report of Mr. Blaine as follows:—

"In the second place it seemed to be impossible for the Canadian Government, in view of its present political relations and obligations, to extend to American goods a preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was a part of the British Empire, they did not consider it competent for the Dominion Government to enter into any commercial arrangement with the United States, from the benefit of which Great Britain and its colonies should be excluded."

It is not for this Government to argue against this announcement of Canadian official opinion. It must be accepted, however, I think, as the statement of a condition which places an insuperable barrier in the way of the attainment of that large and beneficial intercourse and reciprocal trade which might otherwise be developed between the United States and the Dominion.

And Mr. Blaine, in his communication, says:

This fact—that is, the fact that there was reciprocity negotiations in progress between Newfoundland and the United States.

This fact having come to the attention of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, a strong protest was

forwarded by it to the British Government against the ratification of the action of the colonial minister of Newfoundland, and this was followed, in December, 1890, by a proposition initiated and made to me by the British Minister in Washington,—

Not a proposition initiated by Mr. Blaine :

For the opening of formal negotiations in this copy for a treaty embracing commercial reciprocity with Canada, the fisheries, and other unsettled questions with the Dominion Government. I declined to open formal negotiations, but stated that I would be willing to have a full and private conference with the British Minister and one or more agents of Canada, and consider with them every subject connected with the relations of the two countries upon which a mutual interest could be founded, with a view to formal negotiations should the proposed conference indicate a probability of agreement on any of the subjects discussed. This basis was accepted by the British Minister and the Dominion Government, but for various reasons of convenience to the members of the proposed conference it did not take place until 10th February, when the British Minister presented to me, at the Department of State, Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, Hon. George E. Foster, Minister of Finance, and Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, Minister of Customs, as commissioners on the part of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to participate with him in the conference.

At the first conference, on 10th February, the commissioner stated that they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 (which was terminated in 1866 by the action of the Congress of the United States), with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require.

I have often been curious to know what was meant by this extension and modification of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. I did expect at times that the Government would claim they meant that they were willing to go beyond natural products, and the language perhaps would have borne them out in that assertion. I do not think that I ever heard the assertion made ; but expected at times that it would be made, as the ambiguity of the language left room for doubt. Mr. Blaine throws light on the subject. He seems to have been troubled also with a little curiosity on the subject, and he says :

In answer to an inquiry, the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedules of articles should be confined to natural products and should not embrace manufactured articles.

So that settles our Finance Minister's meaning on that point :

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854 nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone ; and that, in view of the great development of industrial interests of the United States and of the changed conditions of the commercial relations of the two countries since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for free or favoured exchange in any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

The commissioners then inquired if the Government of the United States would expect to have preferential treatment extended to the list of manufactured goods of the United States on their introduction into Canada by virtue of a reciprocity treaty, or whether it would regard the Canadian Government as at liberty to extend the same favours to the manufactured goods of other countries not parties to the treaty on their introduction into Canada.

The reply given them was that it was the desire of the Government of the United States to make a reciprocity convention which would be exclusive in its application to the United States and Canada, and that other countries which are not parties to it should not enjoy gratuitously the favours which the two neighbouring countries might reciprocally concede to each other for valuable considerations and at a large sacrifice of their respective revenues.

Upon receiving this reply, the Canadian commissioners asked that the further consideration of the subject be adjourned till another conference, to enable them to consult as to the course which they would adopt in view of the foregoing declaration.

In the conference of the 11th the Canadian commissioners stated that they had given careful consideration to the suggestion that manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for exchange in a reciprocity convention, and to the desire expressed by the Government of the United States that such American goods on their introduction into Canada should be accorded preferential treatment over similar goods from other countries ; and they announced, with an expression of regret, that they did not consider it possible to meet the expectations of the Government of the United States in these respects. In the first place they encountered a serious obstacle in the matter of revenue. If any considerable list of manufactured goods of the United States should be admitted free into Canada, it would entail a material loss to the Dominion Treasury, and if the same favours were likewise extended to the merchandise of other countries the loss of revenue would be much greater. They felt that they would not be able to recoup these losses by other methods of taxation. In the second place, it seemed to be impossible for the Canadian Government, in view of its present political relations and obligations, to extend to American goods a preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was a part of the British Empire, they did not consider it competent for the Dominion Government to enter into any commercial arrangement with the United States, from the benefits of which Great Britain and its cloonies should be excluded.

The announcement of these conclusions of the Canadian commissioners was accepted as a bar to further negotiations on this subject, and it was not again discussed, except in connection with the fishing privileges on the Atlantic coast.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is evident from the documents I have presented to the House, emanating from American authorities, that the general assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries was not proposed, that it was not deemed necessary. It is further evident from these documents that the American authorities at Washington were prepared to enter upon reciprocity negotiations, not upon the basis of unrestricted, but upon the basis of partial reciprocity in goods. Mr. Blaine said to the commissioners, according to his own statement and according to the statement of Secretary Foster, that if the natural products of Canada were to be admitted free into the markets of the United States, the United States would require from Canada

the concession of corresponding privileges, that they would require from Canada the admission into the Canadian markets, not of an unlimited variety of the manufactures of the United States, but a list of manufactured goods to be agreed upon, and he invited a proposal from the Canadian commissioners as to what list of manufactured goods they would be willing to concede. He invited their proposals intimating that he was ready to treat. He did not lay down the ultimatum; he did not say: We must have admitted into the Canadian markets all the manufactured articles of the United States. He invited them to make proposals, and said it would be necessary to have a list of manufactured goods, &c., from all we can gather from the language of Mr. Blaine that list might have been an extensive one or it might be a restricted one. I believe it was possible for the commissioners of Canada to have secured a treaty at that time by the suggestion of a list of manufactured goods, little, if any more extensive, than the list embraced in the Brown draft treaty. And I repeat that they might have suggested a list of goods to be admitted free from the United States which could have received preferential treatment in the markets of Canada without great injury to British trade in this country. We import a great variety of articles from the United States almost exclusively. We import coal oil, barbed wire, agricultural implements, locomotives, cars, steam threshers, axes, spades and a great variety of tools and other manufactury, and we could have suggested at extensive list of manufactured goods. If the commissioners had acted upon the suggestion and invitation of Mr. Blaine and had proposed that list to him for his consideration, we could then have known whether we could have obtained a reciprocity treaty on terms admissible or favourable to this country or not. But the commissioners refused to open negotiations at all; they refused to adopt a single diplomatic expedient. They said in effect: Here are our terms; admit our raw materials free of duty or throw up the negotiation, as you please. That was the best possible way of securing the defeat of the purpose they professed to have in view when they visited Washington. Sir, I assert, as I have asserted repeatedly before, that we can get a reciprocity treaty with the United States upon fair and equitable terms. The Government could have had it upon favourable terms, even from the Republican Administration at Washington, and still better opportunities are afforded now that the Democratic Administration is in power. I repeat that the Government trifled with the interests of this country, they deceived the people of the country, they went to Washington, not to get a treaty, but to make a treaty impossible. They did not want a treaty. They made such proposals as they knew would defeat reciprocity; they did it deliberately, with malice aforethought, without any intention, desire or hope of getting a treaty, and they spurned the proposition made by the American authorities, the reasonable proposition, inviting them to make a proposal. The American authorities said: We are ready to open negotiations; let us talk this matter over; let us see how far you would go in admitting our manufactures free into your country; suggest a list of goods and let us talk it over and see about it. But our representatives said; "No; we suggest no list; we will not admit into Canada a single article of your manufactured goods; we demand as an ultimatum that you shall accede to our terms holus bolus, or we will throw up the negotiations. Then the Minister comes back here with what Mr. Blaine said with regard to the difficulty as to wool and woollens; pointing out to him, according to his own statement, that is that it would be necessary to have a uniform tariff on wool and woollens; that it would not do to have Canada admitting wool free and the United States charging 10 cents per pound, and then exchanging goods manufactured from wool on a free trade basis, and when Mr. Blaine pointed out this and said there should be a uniform tariff in reference to wool and woolens our representatives come back and say that Mr. Blaine demanded a uniform tariff for the whole list, and that upon the lines of the American tariff. The assertion is absurd, especially in view of Mr. Blaine's express declaration that it is not true, and Secretary Foster's declaration that it is not true, together with the internal evidence contained in Minister Foster's report. It seems the most natural thing in the world that the difficulty between the parties is explained by the discovery that Mr. Blaine referred to a single article and that Minister Foster supposed his reference was to all articles. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I believe the question of veracity is obviated. It was a most distressing and unfortunate position of things to have the Secretary of State of the United States, who is dead, and the Secretary of State of the United States who succeeded that great Secretary, Mr. Blaine, making a statement diametrically and exactly and positively opposite to the statement made by the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury-benches in this House. I am glad to have a loophole through which we can see how to reconcile the differences and to establish the fact that that difficulty rests upon a misunderstanding on the part of Minister Foster and his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, we shall have this reciprocity treaty discussed again. The issue is not dead; the necessity of obtaining reciprocity has not ceased, the need of this country for a wider market and for its natural market is as great as ever; the people of Canada are as desirous of obtaining reciprocity as they ever were. The people have been misled; they have been

led to suppose that difficulties existed surrounding this question, difficulties of an insuperable character, while, upon close investigation, we find that these difficulties vanish away. There is no difficulty in obtaining a reciprocity treaty with the United States in my opinion, but we cannot have it all our own way. We cannot have the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which worked so greatly to our advantage that we exported $2 worth of goods free of duty that formerly bore a duty, where we imported $1 worth from the United States formerly dutiable. We cannot expect to have a reciprocity treaty exclusively in our own interest. If we are to sell the United States untold millions of the natural products of this country, if we are to secure that trade which will increase millions upon millions annually, we have got to give something in consideration for the advantage; we have got to make a reciprocity treaty, and a reciprocity treaty means a mutally advantageous treaty, where the advantages are reciprocal between the contracting parties. If we obtain access to that market, we have got to give them access to some extent to our market, and it should be the care of the Government to ascertain if that can be done; when invited to make a proposition they should be ready to make one; they should endeavour to secure a treaty. They did not endeavour to do that in 1891 and in 1892; they made no effort to get a treaty; their whole course warrants me in asserting that they did not desire to make a treaty. That was not their object when they went to Washington. Their purpose was to deceive the country during the elections, in order to deprive the Liberal party of the advantage that an appeal to the country in favour of reciprocity, would naturally give them. Their object was to deceive the people, to make them believe that the Conservative party were as favourable to reciprocity and as likely to obtain it, as the Liberals were. Then, when they obtained power, they went to Washington ostensibly to carry out the purposes they professed to have in view, but actually to block the road to obtaining reciprocity, and they did do this by making proposals that were not admissible, asking for things that were unattainable; and they came back to the people of this country professing to have met difficulties that did not exist, and now they are discredited as to their truthfulness and their honesty towards the people, by the revelation of facts that has subsequently been made

ney should
ey did not
l in 1892 ;
aty ; their
erting that
aty. That
went to
to deceive
in order
ne advant-
in favour
ive them.
people, to
nservative
rocity and
rals were.
they went
out the
view, but
obtaining
y making
ble, ask-
tainable ;
e of this
difficulties
are dis-
and their
e revela-
tly been